REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-15, 17-19, and 23-28 were pending in the application. Claims 1, 9, 14, and 19 have been amended. Claims 23-28 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-15, and 17-19 remain pending in the application.

Support for the amendments to claims 1, 9, 14, and 19 may be found in Applicant's specification at least in paragraphs [0043] and [0044].

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-15, 17-19, and 23-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teegan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,748,555, hereinafter "Teegan") in view of Suresh (U.S. Patent No. 7,143,396). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection in light of the following remarks.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of a claimed invention, all claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974), MPEP 2143.03. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, taken individually or in combination, do not teach the combinations of features as recited in the claims.

Teegan discloses techniques for monitoring interactions with software objects to generate operational management information for managing programs on a plurality of computers (Teegan, Abstract). A proxy object and a monitored application are both instantiated (Teegan, col. 26, lines 39-51). A pointer to the proxy object is provided to a client computer, and a reference to the monitored application is provided to the proxy object (Teegan, col. 26, lines 39-51). The proxy object intercepts a method call from the client computer, notifies a monitoring process, and forwards the method call to the monitored application (Teegan, col. 26, lines 39-51). Teegan's proxy object is placed

between the monitored object and the client program and is external to both the monitored object and the client program.

Suresh discloses techniques for measuring the time spent executing a portion of a computer program (Suresh, col. 3, lines 13-15). Instrumentation code is inserted into the computer program and generates timestamps at particular probe points (Suresh, col. 3, lines 15-20). An original instruction immediately following each probe point is replicated in a corresponding probe function which also includes a timer routine (Suresh, col. 4, lines 8-22; Fig. 2). A pointer to the probe function is inserted into the program (in place of the original instruction) so that the original instruction is encountered within the probe function instead of in its original location (Suresh, col. 4, lines 8-22; Fig. 2).

Claim 1, on the other hand, recites a combination of features including, *interalia*, "wherein each of the standard programming functions is external to the respective calling application" and "wherein each of the alternative implementations of the standard programming functions is internal to the respective calling application." Independent claims 9, 14, and 19 each recite combinations including similar features. Such combinations are not taught by the cited references, taken both individually and in combination.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 9, 14, and 19 are patentably distinct over the cited references. The respective dependent claims are believed to be patentably distinct at least due to their dependence on the independent claims. Because the rejection has been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejections.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If a phone interview would speed allowance of any pending claims, such is requested at the Examiner's convenience.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5760-20100/BNK.

Respectfully submitted,

B. Noel Kivlin
Reg. No. 33,929
Attorney for Applicant(s)

MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN,
   KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C.
P. O. Box 398
Austin, Texas 78767
(512) 853-8800

Date: December 3, 2008